

*FB*  
**FILED**

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF  
ILLINOIS

AUG 29 2008 *lw*  
*Aug 29, 2008*  
MICHAEL W. DOBBINS  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

BURNEY ROBINSON  
PLAINTIFF

V.

COOK COUNTY STATE'S ATTORNEY  
DEFENDANT  
CO. DEFENDANT  
BRODERICK JONES

CASE# 08-c-4337

MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE OF  
LATENT FINGERPRINT  
ANALYSIS AND EVIDENCE

ON THE DATE AND TIME OF JULY 12, 2001 EVIDENCE WAS INVENTORIED BY THE CITY CITY OF CHICAGO AND ITS REPRESENTATIVES FOR ANALYSIS FOR ASSESSMENT. IT HAS COME TO MY KNOWLEDGE THAT FINGERPRINT EVIDENCE WAS SUPPRESSED THIS WAS MATERIAL TO A PROCEEDING AND TO GUILT OF THE PLAINTIFF THE PLAINTIFF WAS WITHOUT COUNSEL IN A PRE-TRIAL HEARING THERE WAS NO ATTEMPT TO ASSESS THE VALIDITIY OF THE EVIDENCE AND THE LAB OF THE COUNTY OF COOK HAS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF TESTING AND WITHOUT PROPER COUNSEL A TEST WAS NOT MADE THIS IS MADE TO ASSESS THE PUNISHMENT OF MR. ROBINSON AND THE JUDGMENT USED TO DO SO. BECAUSE THIS SUPPRESSION MAY HAVE BEEN MATERIAL TO GUILT. BRADY V. MARYLAND 373 U.S. 83.. AT THE TIME THE PLAINTIFF WAS THEN A DEFENDANT AGAINST THE STATE AND UNAWARE OF THE ACTION THAT TOOK PLACE. THIS REQUEST FOR ANALYSIS IS BASED ON THE FACT THAT THE STATE'S ATTORNEY DEPRIVED THE PLAINTIFF OF LIBERTY BY THIS PERJURY. THIS PERJURY WAS COMMITED BY TESTIMONY AND BY EVIDENCE AND SUPPRESSED BY THE STATE DELIBERATELY TO PROCURE THE CONVICTION AND IMPRISONMENT.. IN THE CASE OF MOONEY V. HOLOHAN 294 U.S. 103, 112,... AND AS A RESULT OF THESE FACTS ALLEGATIONS WERE PERJURED TESTIMONY KNOWINGLY USED BY THE STATE TO OBTAIN A CONVICTION.. AS IN THE CASE OF , PYLE V. KANSAS 317 U.S. 213, 215-216, .. INVENTORY NUMBERS FOR EVIDENCE.

NUMBERS# 2552861 AND 2552862 .....

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

*Burney Robinson*